DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 100 95 EA 009 513

AUTHOR Severance, Melvin J., III
TITLE Education Vouchers Study & Planning Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire Supervisory Union 41, Brookline.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 76
GRANT NIE-G-75-0002
NOTE 83p.; For related documents, see EA 009 511-514

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Alternatives; *Educational Finance; *Education Vouchers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Experimental Programs; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS New Hampshire

ABSTRACT

This publication is the final summary report for an experimental program intended to plan, implement, and evaluate an educational voucher system in the New Hampshire communities of Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett, and Salem. Separate sections of the report discuss the purpose of the voucher program, the background of the program, program procedures, program results, program products, the decision-making process utilized in the program, program outcomes not described in the Phase I and Phase II reports, conclusions of the program staff based on public response to the program, and recommendations for the development of future experimental voucher programs. (JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED139100

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EDUCATION VOUCHERS

STUDY & PLANNING PROJECT

GRANT NUMBER
NIE-G-75-0002

FINAL REPORT

PREPARED BY

THE LOCAL PROJECT STAFF
17 North Street
Manchester, N.H. 03104
(603)669-6800

May, 1976

Melvin J. Severance III
Melvin J. Severance III
Project Director

EA009 513

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of Purpose	1
Background	2
Procedures	3
Administrative Procedures	4
Data Collection Procedures	9
Data Generation Procedures	10
Community Survey - Procedure	11
Public Information Procedure	13
Results	17
Products Generated	17
Process Utilized	23
Other Outcomes	30
Community Survey Results	31
Voucher Values	33
Salem	36
Conclusions	42
District Votes	42
Why Didn't the Voters Support Vouchers?	43
District Gains	44
Recommendations	45
National Level	45
State/Local Level	46
Appendices	47
A - Plan of Action Chart - Phase I	48
B - Plan of Action Chart - Phase II	54
C - Computation of Voucher Difference-Full Use Method	59
D - Computation of Voucher Difference-Partial Use Method	60
E - Warrant Articles for Each Town	
1 - Allenstown	62
2 - Candia	64
3 - Deerfield	65
4 - Hollis	67
5 - Hooksett	68
6 - Salem	69

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The School Boards of Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett and Salem, New Hampshire applied to the National Institute of Education (NIE) for a comprehensive grant of $210,576 dollars to study and to plan for the implementation of an education voucher system as described in the State Board of Education's REVISED FEASIBILITY STUDY of November 14, 1973 (hereafter referred to as the STUDY). Each of the six Boards reviewed the STUDY and conducted an information program on vouchers for the residents of their districts. Based upon the information they received, the residents and Boards in each district indicated an interest in pursuing a test of an education voucher system. The voters or Board members of each district authorized their School Boards to enter a study/planning phase in preparation for the test. The New Hampshire State Board of Education reviewed the qualifications and intentions of each district in light of the STUDY on June 19, 1974. In a formal action the State Board recommended to the NIE that all six school districts be considered as test sites for the voucher system.

It was requested that this grant be awarded to the Supervisory Union Board of Supervisory Union No. 41 on behalf of the School Boards listed above. The purpose of this grant, as elaborated in the STATEMENT OF WORK below, is twofold: first, to enable each district to understand more fully the voucher system through a continuing information program and to estimate the changes that such a system would produce within that district;

second, to conduct all of the necessary planning of transfers, transportation, accounting procedures, etc., for the actual implementation of a voucher program. The School Board in each district was responsible for ensuring that the general tasks outlined below and all other related tasks designated by that Board were accomplished in that district. The activities conducted in each district under this grant were under the sole direction of the local School Board as provided by State statute. Each School Board agreed to work in cooperation with the other School Boards to accomplish those activities requiring inter-district action and to fulfill the terms of this grant.

BACKGROUND

Interest in the study of the impact an education voucher system would have on public education first surfaced at the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1969. OEO was interested in determining whether increased parental control over the allocation of education funds produces improvements in student achievement and public satisfaction with the education children receive. OEO's research program began with one site in the Alum Rock School District, San Jose, California--OEO planned to include several additional test sites with development and operation lasting a period of five to seven years at each site.

In 1974 the education voucher program, along with other OEO research programs, was transferred to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, with a specific assignment for the education voucher program being given to the National Institute of Education.

While all this was taking place at the national level, New Hampshire was busy conducting a federally funded ($109,000) feasibility study. The feasibility study was initially approved by the New Hampshire State Board of Education on August 14, 1974, with the final, REVISED FEASIBILITY STUDY being approved by the same body on November 14, 1974.

Concurrent to the work being done on the development of the feasibility study, information programs were being provided to the school districts in the State of New Hampshire. Ultimately, seven districts--Allenstown, Amherst, Brookline, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, and Hooksett--indicated an interest, not to directly implement an education voucher demonstration, but first, to enter a study and planning phase in preparation for the test. Of these seven districts, Amherst and Brookline voted to drop out in the Spring of 1975 and Salem requested entry in the fall of 1975.

New Hampshire officially embarked on its voyage to study and plan for the implementation of an education voucher demonstration when receipt of grant approval (NIE-G-75-0002--$210,576) from the National Institute of Education was issued on January 31, 1975.

PROCEDURES

Procedures have been divided into three sections. These sections are 1) Administrative Procedures, 2) Data Collection Procedures and 3) Public Information Procedures.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The project administration was made up of an executive board which consisted of one school board member from each of the participating school districts with the superintendents of Supervisory Unions 41, 15, & 53 acting as an executive committee. This group's primary function was to refine the New Hampshire Model so it could be implemented at the local level.

The executive board also had the responsibility of hiring the project staff. In the summer of 1974 candidates for the position of Project Director were reviewed; and later in the fall of the same year, Mr. Robert Shipman was selected as Project Director. (However, Shipman did not officially come on board until February of 1975. He then served as a consultant for the project until he left in mid-March, 1975.) After Mr. Shipman left the project, Melvin J. Severance III was hired by the executive board to serve as Project Director. The Project Director was to report to the executive committee on a regular basis. As director, Mr. Severance was responsible for staffing, programming the tasks to be accomplished, and hiring the necessary consultants. As a first order of business, Mr. Severance reviewed the statement of work contained in the "Proposal to Fund the Study and Planning of the Education Voucher System in New Hampshire, July 12, 1974." From this review, a detailed Plan of Action--PHASE I, PHASE II was developed. (See appendices A & B).

Once project tasks were clearly defined, the Project Director hired staff that would best suit the task needs of the project. Mr. Robert Fay was hired as Assistant Director with responsibility

for data collection, data analysis and reporting. Ms. Barbara Rousseau was hired as Assistant Director for public information with the responsibility for gathering information on public and private schools with special emphasis on information dissemination during the planning/studying phase. It is noted at this time that the project staff attempted in all instances possible to use the studying/planning phase as a test for possible future strategies of operation during an actual implementation. This provided the project staff with its needed information while at the same time allowing for a refinement of potential operational techniques.

In terms of operational procedure, the local staff was provided the necessary autonomy to accomplish its administrative tasks. However, due to inconsistency of interpretation of the New Hampshire Voucher Model, its implications and definition, the executive board slowed down the overall process in an effort to gain a clearer understanding of detail from the NIE. NIE on the other hand did not want to interject constraints into the operational design, thereby causing both parties to "stalemate" the process of task accomplishment at various times during the planning activities. This will be discussed further in the RESULTS & CONCLUSION sections of this final report.

In order to provide the staff with a thorough understanding of the Model, and its expected outcomes, consultants were hired. The primary purpose of consultants was to accomplish tasks to a level of specificity that the staff either did not have the time or expertise to accomplish. The major topical

areas were as follows:

LEGAL QUESTIONS

ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS

EVALUATION DESIGN

MODEL REFINEMENT

TRANSPORTATION DESIGNS

At the outset (March-June of 1975), the Center for the Study of Public Policy was very helpful. This Cambridge, Massachusetts based technical assistance center provided the staff and local director with extremely helpful background data, as well as information needed to accomplish many of the PHASE I tasks. Specifically, Peter Bateman was most helpful in his attendance at early meetings with teachers, school board members, and public information gatherings throughout the school districts.

Meetings were held monthly with the full membership of the Executive Board. However, meetings with the Executive Committee were held much more frequently. Minutes of the Executive Board meetings are on file in Supervisory Union #41, Brookline, New Hampshire.

The majority of the Executive Committee meetings were informal, yet notes of several of these sessions are on file with the Official Executive Board Minutes.

In order that the reader be provided with some appreciation of local involvement, I have provided in the following pages, a capsule view of executive meetings.

DATE	SUBJECT MATTER
March 6, 1975	-Executive Committee - present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, State Director (SD) Milne, Local Director (LD) Shipman. -Purpose - operational discussion of communication procedure, meeting dates, role of Executive Board, money handling and purchases.
March 17, 1975	-Executive Committee - present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne, LD Shipman. -Purpose - operational questions were addressed, whether or not to continue with the withdrawal of Amherst and Brookline - check out the implications of the incentive grant, staffing questions, budget report.
March 21, 1975	-Conference - present were Comm. Paire, Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne, LD Shipman -Purpose - to review guidelines for N.H. Education Voucher Project, discussion was operational in nature.
March 24, 1975 (NOTE: it appears from these minutes that representatives from NIE attended the 3/21/75 meeting.)	-Executive Committee - present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne, LD Shipman -Purpose - review of 3/21/75 meeting, operational questions, budget questions, incentive grant questions, Phase I operation.
March 31, 1975	-Executive Committee - present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne, LD Shipman. (Schoepf left the meeting early.) -Purpose - operational, bids, quotes, money.
April 14, 1975	-Executive Committee - present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne. -Purpose - to select a new project director.
April 15, 1975	-Executive Board Meeting - Board members Rideout, Larsen, VanVliet, Descoteaux; Supts. Cawley, Schoepf, Croteau; Acting Director Milne; Deputy Comm. Brunelle. -Purpose - the withdrawal of LD Shipman, the hiring of LD Severance, operational questions.
April 21 through May	-There were no formal executive board or committee meetings. Staff was hired. Several meetings took place with superintendents and consultants.

June 3, 1975	-Executive Committee - Present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, LD Severance. -Purpose - Approval of consultant contracts, role of site-historian.
July 9, 1975	-Executive Committee - Present were Supts. Cawley, Schoepf, LD Severance. -Purpose - Approval of consultant contract, information dissemination process, budget report.
August 6, 1975	-Executive Committee - Present were Supts. Cawley, Croteau, Schoepf, SD Milne, LD Severance. -Purpose - Determine the definition of choice and alternative, evaluation design determination, definition of approved school, approval of consultant, community information material and budget review.
August 7, 1975	-Meeting of local project - Present were LD Severance, Consultants Gustafson and Menge, NIE-Cunningham and Piccini, McDermott, Bateman and Donaldson. -Purpose - To determine NIE evaluation needs in terms of local expectations with regard to design responsibility.
September 11, 1975	-Executive Board meeting - Present were 5 local board members, all 3 supts., SD Milne, LD Severance and staff, G. Donaldson. -Purpose - Review PHASE I report.
September 23, 1975	-Executive Board - Present were board members from all 5 districts, all 3 supts., SD Milne, LD Severance and Staff, G. Donaldson. -Purpose - To present the structure of the EVA, VRC, accounting systems, transportation models, definitions of choice, alternative, public information design, incentive grant.
October 15, 1975	-Executive Board Meeting - Present were all 5 board members, 3 supts., SD Milne, LD Severance and Staff, G. Donaldson. -Purpose - Continue discussion of the EVA, VRC, refinement of definitions, review of per pupil cost in each district, layout teacher and administrative meeting to be scheduled.
November 24, 1975	-Executive Board Meeting - Present were 4 board members, Supts. Croteau, Cawley, Johnson (Salem), Consultant Menge, CSPP-Cohen, Bateman, State Dept. of Education-Brunelle, SD Milne, LD Severance and Staff, G. Donaldson. -Purpose - Re-direction of local districts, prevention of model distortion, question

NIE via CSPP representatives; approval of Salem entering the studying & planning activities, discussion of the supply-demand response to choice.

December 15, 1975 -Executive Board Meeting - Present were Supt. Cawley, board members, SD Milne, LD Severance and Staff, G. Donaldson.
-Purpose - Finalize the inclusion of Salem, local staff received permission to begin operational refinement of the New Hampshire Model.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

The data collection effort of the Study/Planning Project consisted primarily of obtaining information about people and money in the involved towns. The PHASE I REPORT contained substantial information in these areas in the community profiles. Subsequent to the publishing of that report, this information was maintained and updated as new information became available so that current information on enrollments and finances were available for use in the PHASE II REPORT.

The PHASE I REPORT expressed concern that different sources of information, particularly enrollment, provided different values which were conflicting. The PHASE II REPORT, in its definition section, identified the specific source of information (report) that would be used to obtain a specific value. The purpose of showing the possible variations of information in PHASE I was to alert local school boards to this reality. PHASE II then informed them as to which report the Voucher Authority would consider as basic. The absolute accuracy of any report cannot be determined, but the choice of report is based on overall reliability and use.

An example of the effort expended to verify the accuracy of a report was the census work done in the town of Hollis. Project staff worked with a parents' group in that town to conduct a house-to-house census effort in the fall of 1975. Results of this enumeration, when compared to 1975-1976 fall enrollments, still did not provide an exact match, but subjectively the report was considered to be much more "reliable" than the preceding year's, particularly in the area of numbers of children in private schools. Until there is a program such as a voucher demonstration, where individual school-age children's records are required regardless of school attended, no increase in the accuracy of the school census is or should be anticipated.

DATA GENERATION PROCEDURES

The primary areas of data generation in this project were enrollments and voucher value.

Required enrollment data was primarily enrollment projections and the breakdown into specific areas such as special education, vocational education, and private schools.

Preliminary enrollment projections for the original participating towns were done in house using the cohort-survival technique and reported in PHASE I.

Enrollment estimates for the school year 1976-1977 were done independently by each local district to determine their "normal" budget estimates, so this project obtained and used the same figures to be consistent in the comparisons.

Procedures for obtaining base-line enrollment data were discussed with C.M. Leinwand Associates personnel, in the event

of implementation, and tentative plans for obtaining raw data were roughed out.

In the area of voucher value computation, the procedure was to devise and/or define a method, develop a worksheet to conform, and then make the individual district computations using the worksheet. As the process developed, when corrections, omissions and changes were made in the method, the worksheet(s) were revised to reflect these changes. Resulting worksheets were shown in the PHASE II REPORT and also in the Appendices section of this report.

COMMUNITY SURVEY - PROCEDURE

The community survey effort was "early planned, but late completed." A chronological listing of events will perhaps give the clearest and most concise summary to support this statement.

1975

June 27	Received a preliminary quote from Cambridge Survey Research, Inc. to accomplish various phases of a community survey. This quote had been requested by the project since CSR had conducted earlier surveys for the state voucher office.
July 2	Discussed the design of a survey instrument with Dotty Lynch of CSR. It had been decided that this work would be contracted and CSR had previous experience in both geographical and subject area.
July 8	Entered into contract agreement with Cambridge Survey Research, Inc. for the design of the cummunity survey instrument.
July 24	Copies of articles and other sample questionnaires were sent to CSR for reference and review.
Aug. 4	Received a draft copy of the survey instrument from CSR for review.

Aug. 20 Sent requests for quote to a list of possible survey contractors, with a copy of draft survey instrument.

Aug. 27 Sent copy of survey instrument to NIE for review and approval.

Aug. 28 Received proposal and quotation from CSR.

Sept. 2 Sent copy of survey instruments to CSPP, Executive Board, State Office for review and comments.

Sept. 5 Received proposal and quotation from Northeast Marketing Institute, the only other respondent to our request for quote.

Sept. 12 Awarded contract to CSR, the survey to be conducted when instrument was approved by NIE.

Sept. 26 Received comments and recommendations re: survey instruments from state office.

Oct. 22 Visited by P. Bateman and M. McDermott of CSPP to discuss questions on survey instrument.

Nov. 4 Final draft copies of survey instrument sent to CSR and NIE.

Nov. 24 Received clearance for survey instrument from NIE.

Dec. 5 Conference with Dotty Lynch of CSR at project office to finalize plans for community survey. CSR was given go-ahead to conduct the survey at once.

1976

Jan. 15 Received preliminary survey results from CSR by telephone regarding "shift" figures.

Jan. 20 Received printed complete survey results from CSR.

Jan. 23 Received a quote upon request from CSR to conduct a telephone survey in Salem, based on the same instrument used in other five towns. CSR was instructed to proceed with the survey.

Feb. 27 Received results of the Salem survey.

PUBLIC INFORMATION PROCEDURES

Two major decisions made early in June, 1975, by the project staff impacted on the nature of the public information system:

1. That we maintain a low profile, at least during the early stages of the project, with an intensive rush of information during the last six weeks prior to the annual school district meetings.
2. To provide consistent and factual data dissemination. A review of the early press clippings, reports and comments made by people involved in the early stages of the project, and our own experiences indicated that credibility had to be maintained if the project stood a chance of being implemented. To that end, we agreed on one official spokesman for the staff, director, Melvin Severance III, who would be solely responsible for addressing the public forum. All other public information tasks were handled by Barbara Rousseau as outlined in the PLAN OF ACTION CHARTS--PHASES I & II. (See Appendices A & B).

Gathering, analyzing, summarizing, and disseminating consistent and factual information about the voucher project to the proper audience(s) necessitated first an identification of those audiences.

Education directories--state and local--provided the names of professional educators; town reports, the names of school board and budget committee members; resident tax lists, school registers, and school census reports, the names of parents of

public and private school children; the public information office at the State Department of Education provided a list of media representatives; proponents as well as opponents of the voucher concept were established from previous press releases, correspondence on file, and hearsay.

Printed materials for dissemination fell into three major categories--press releases, bulk mailings, and the PHASE I & II REPORTS. (Copies on file in Supervisory Union 41 office.)

Press releases originated from the office in some instances and from press inquiries in others. Those originating from the office were prepared by the public information director. Inquiries made by the press were dealt with by whomever was in the office at the time of inquiry--most usually, the director was able to deal with these inquiries. (Copies on file in Supervisory Union 41 office.)

Brochures were prepared after a complete review of previously published materials had been conducted. Input throughout the working of the project was utilized as well as the results of the community survey in the preparation of the question and answer brochure. An attempt was made to avoid jargon where possible. (Copies on file in Supervisory Union 41 office.)

Brochure content went from the general to the specific--the first three brochures mailed to the residents of the voucher communities were very general in nature. The fourth, and last brochure, addressed specific questions and answers. This fourth and last brochure was mailed to the residents one week prior to the annual school district vote.

The project's executive board and NIE approved the brochures before they were disseminated.

Brochures were mailed to the resident tax payers of the voucher communities, to school personnel--both voucher district and contiguous--the press, and identified advocates and opponents. (Mailing lists on file in Supervisory Union 41 office.)

The PHASE I & II REPORTS established the "state of the art" and the "systems for implementation" respectively. The components of these two reports were prepared by the project staff and a number of consultants with final editing of copy being the responsibility of the public information director.

These reports were disseminated to the usual audiences, with the exception of residents, but including the libraries in the voucher district communities.

All printed materials were submitted for bid before a final contract was issued to a printer.

Telephone inquiries and correspondence about the voucher project/demonstration were handled by the public information director on the spot or within a twenty-four hour period.

Another charge of the public information director was to identify the educational alternatives available to the students in the six voucher communities.

The first step in this procedure was to identify the schools--both public and private--in the voucher districts. Superintendents and/or directors were then contacted and permission requested to collect data from their principals.

A school descriptive statement was formated (See PHASE I REPORT) for the purpose of collecting this information which would then be summarized for distribution to parents.

Schools in Massachusetts and New Hampshire were surveyed. Of the 120 plus schools surveyed, only 34 returned the completed school descriptive statement, and none of them offered a firm commitment to accept voucher students if and when implementation occured. (Copies on file in Supervisory Union 41 office.)

Community information through the public forum underwent changes from the original plan. Because of problems encountered at the planning level as mentioned in the administrative procedures section, and because we wished to maintain a high degree of credibility, we did not go to the public with information sessions in October-November as originally planned; but instead, waited until February-March, immediately before the annual school district meetings.

Teacher and school principal meetings were scheduled and held in June, 1975, and February, 1976, for the purpose of keeping school personnel up to date with the project happenings. These meetings were conducted by the project director.

During early March, 1976, the project director appeared on closed circuit television and on an "open mike" radio program, which were both well received by the residents of Salem, New Hampshire.

PHASE II tasks--systems design--were completed in cooperation with the project staff and consultants after consideration of the constraints built into the existing public and private school administrative structures.

RESULTS

This section has been divided into three subsections in order that all project results are properly categorized. The three subsections are as follows:

PRODUCTS GENERATED

PROCESS UTILIZED

OTHER OUTCOMES

The Products Generated subsection identifies the hard copy reports that were produced. These reports were generated as a result of the project purpose (work statement).

As in most group activities, the voucher project utilized a process to accomplish certain outcomes and tasks. An outline of personnel interaction and their corresponding implications are documented in this section.

Other Outcomes is a section that is included to indicate peripheral results generated from project interaction with the communities in general and individuals of these communities specifically.

PRODUCTS GENERATED

The primary hard copy results of the study and planning activities are those mandated by the statement of work in the "Proposal to Fund the Study and Planning of the Education Voucher System in New Hampshire," (July 12, 1974).

The proposal detailed two major reports. These reports became known as the PHASE I and PHASE II REPORTS. The purpose of these reports was to prepare both the participating

communities and the State Department of Education for a possible implementation of a voucher demonstration.

This preparation was in the form of participatory construction of the operational systems, as well as refinement of the New Hampshire Education Voucher Model.

Consequentiy, the PHASE I REPORT detailed the following items:

SECTION I - COMMUNITY PROFILES
- Study of School Age Population by District
- General Population and Student Projections
- Attachments:
  - Description of Towns:
    - Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hocksett
  - Community Profile Data Sheets
    - Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett
  - Five-Year Comparative Census Study
    - Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett
  - Financial Comparison of School Districts
  - Enrollment and Population Projections
    - Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett
  - Summary Data Report
    - Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett

SECTION II - EDUCATIONAL ALTERNATIVES
- Attachments:
  - Identification of Schools
    - Contiguous schools (Public, N.H.)
    - Voucher schools (Public, N.H.)
    - Contiguous schools (Private, N.H.)
    - Contiguous schools (Public, Mass.)
  - School Descriptive Statement

SECTION III - COMMUNITY INFORMATION
- Attachments:
  - Public Information Media List
  - Tentative Community Information Schedule and Strategies
  - Brochure I - WHAT IS AN EDUCATION VOUCHER
  - Brochure II - CONCEPTS AND CONTROVERSIES ABOUT ED. VOUCHERS
  - Brochure III - HOW THE NEW HAMPSHIRE EDUCATION VOUCHER SYSTEM WORKS.

SECTION IV - COMMUNITY SURVEY

SECTION V - DEFINITION OF CHOICE

SECTION VI - TRANSPORTATION EVALUATION
Attachments:
Definition of Items on Analysis of Transportation Reports

Description of Towns:
Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett

Analysis of Transportation Reports
Allenstown, Candia, Deerfield, Hollis, Hooksett

SECTION VII - RESEARCH OUTLINE
Attachments:
Evaluation: Information/Management Flow

Matrix of Research Objectives

SECTION VIII - UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS

With the information contained in the PHASE I REPORT, the local project staff was able to begin to formulate the first designs of the operational systems needed to implement an Educational Voucher System using the New Hampshire Model. These systems and, where applicable, needed definitions are detailed in the PHASE II REPORT.

The following outline details the major operational areas for implementation of the New Hampshire Model as set forth in the PHASE II REPORT:

1.0 VOUCHER REVIEW COMMITTEE
- 1.1 VRC Membership
- 1.2 Functions
  - 1.2.1 Exception
- 1.3 Staff Support and Funding
  - 1.3.1 VRC Budget

2.0 DISTRICT MEETING
- 2.1 The Warrant and Voucher Related Articles
- 2.2 Pre-Meeting Procedures
  - 2.2.1 Preliminary Budget Finalized
    - 2.2.1.1 Voucher Budget Presentation Philosophy

2.2.1.2 Voucher Budget Preparation Procedure
2.2.2 Budget Committee Public Hearing
2.2.2.1 Proposed Budget Expenditures
2.2.2.2 Proposed Budget Revenues
2.2.2.3 District Assessment

3.0 VOUCHER VALUE
3.1 Voucher Definitions
3.2 Methods of Calculation
3.3 Procedures
3.3.1 Basic Voucher Value
3.3.2 Supplemental Voucher Value

4.0 VOUCHER USE
4.1 Geographical Limitations
4.2 Standards and Procedures for State Board Approval of Eligible Providers Under RSA 194-A
4.3 Procedures for Following and Cashing Vouchers Taken Outside of Each District
4.3.1 Following Vouchers Taken Outside Each District
4.3.2 Cashing Vouchers Taken Outside of Each Participating District
4.4 Schedule for Redemption/Cashing of Vouchers Taken Outside of Each District

5.0 ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISMS
5.1 EVA Legal Authority
5.2 EVA Board Membership
5.2.1 EVA Board Functions
5.3 EVA Functions
5.3.1 Public Information
5.3.1.1 Staffing
5.3.1.2 Location
5.3.1.3 Functions
5.3.1.4 Collecting Information
5.3.1.5 Verifying Information
5.3.1.6 Disseminating Information
5.3.1.7 Parent Counselors
5.3.2 Evaluation
5.3.2.1 Function
5.3.2.2 Responsibility
5.3.2.3 Evaluation Policies
5.3.3 EVA Accounting
5.3.3.1 Design and Publication of Voucher Documents
5.3.3.1.1 Voucher Certificate
5.3.3.1.2 Voucher Quarterly Coupons
5.3.3.2 Voucher Flow and Cash Flow
5.3.3.2.1 Coupon Processing
5.3.3.2.2 Procedures and Amounts for Pro-Rating Vouchers
5.3.3.3 School District Treasurer
5.3.3.3.1 In-District Payment
5.3.3.3.2 Out-of District Payment

5.3.3.4 Pupil Accounting
5.3.3.5 Administrative Costs (EVA & VRC)
5.4 EVA Staffing Authority
5.4.1 Staff Impact Matrix
5.4.2 EVA Staff Rationale
5.4.2.1 Full-Time Personnel
5.4.2.1-A Diagram No. 1
5.4.2.2 Part-Time Personnel
5.4.2.2.1 Parent Counselors
5.4.2.2.2 Data Collectors
5.4.2.2.3 Substitute Staff
5.4.2.2.4 Clerical Assistance
5.5 EVA Budget
5.6 Budget Summary
5.6.1 NIE Grants

6.0 FEDERAL GRANTS
6.1 Total Incentive Grants
6.1.1 Method of Calcuation
6.1.2 Purpose and Use
6.1.3 Restrictions
6.2 Transportation Grant
6.2.1 Method of Calculation
6.2.2 Purpose and Use
6.3 Administrative Grant
6.3.1 Method of Calculation
6.3.2 Purpose and Use
6.3.3 Restrictions
6.4 Tuition Grants
6.4.1 Method of Calculation
6.4.2 Purpose and Use
6.4.3 Restrictions
6.5 Staff Support Grant
6.5.1 Method of Calculation
6.5.2 Purpose and Use
6.5.3 Restrictions
6.6 Categorical Aid Guarantee

7.0 VOUCHER DISTRIBUTION
7.1 Determine Parent/Legal Guardian Eligibility for Basic Voucher
7.2 Determine Student Eligibility
7.3 Determine Parent's/Legal Guardian's Eligibility to Receive Supplemental Vouchers
7.4 Voucher Distribution Process
7.4.1 Orientation
7.4.2 Registration Process/Voucher Distribution
7.5 "Transfers and Late Entry (Resolution of Disputes)"

8.0 TRANSPORTATION
8.1 System Analysis
8.1.1 Transportation System Budget

8.2 Two-Way Radio Equipment
8.2.1 Radio Equipment Cost Breakdown
8.2.1.1 Purchase
8.2.1.2 Lease-Purchase
8.3 Predicted Bus Routes
8.4 Summary

9.0 NEW SCHOOLS
9.1 Assess Interest in Developing New Schools
9.2 Respond to Interest
9.3 Procedures

10.0 EVALUATION DESIGN
10.1 Matrix of Research Objectives
10.2 Evaluation Design Content
10.2.1 Procedures and Responsibilities for Voucher Schools
10.2.2 Checklist for Essential Features for Educational Alternatives
10.2.2.1 Use of Checklists
10.2.2.2 Checklist Example--Individualized Instruction
10.2.2.3 Summary
10.2.3 Voucher School Documentation Form
10.2.4 Student Profile Data Form
10.2.5 Student Achievement - Student Attitude
10.2.6 Parent Survey
10.2.7 Teacher Survey
10.2.8 Policy Maker - Administrator Survey
10.2.9 Duplication of Information
10.3 Time-Line of Major Evaluation Events

11.0 PHASE OUT
11.1 Sixth Year (1981-1982 School Year)
11.1.1 Public Information
11.1.2 Evaluation
11.2 Seventh Year (1982-1983 School Year)
11.2.1 Accounting System
11.2.2 Transportation
11.3 Completion of Phase Out
11.3.1 Phase-Out Summary Diagram

The following items are secondary hard copy reports that were generated from specific surveys and data collection activities which, in part, make up the PHASE I and II REPORTS. The one exception to this is the Community Survey. The Community Survey results were forwarded to NIE, New Hampshire

State Department of Education, and local school boards under separate cover.

1) Transportation study - the prime results are included in the PHASE II REPORT; however, actual survey data has been left with each district involved in the Study & Planning activities.
2) Community Survey results - as mentioned above, this was forwarded to all parties under separate cover, with copies sent to each district's Supervisory Union Office.
3) Analysis of data collection - a summary of these activities conducted in the five districts was placed in the PHASE I REPORT with specific data left with Supervisory Unions. (See Other Outcomes.)

NOTE: All supportive materials are available at Supervisory Union #41, Brookline, New Hampshire.

PROCESS UTILIZED

The project director used a centralized decision making process to develop first draft documents. Project staff and consultants were involved in the first drafting of all definitions and systems. The reason for this was to save the local boards time in the decision-making process.

Once a first draft was prepared, it was tested with the local superintendents. The results of the superintendents' input was used to modify the first draft, thus creating a second draft document. In most, but not all, cases it was second draft documents that were presented to the local board members at the executive board meetings.

At the second stage (executive board), a decentralized participatory form of document or positional development was attempted. This effort generated further input for revisions. It was at this stage that difficulties began. Definitions of terms to be used, restrictions in model design, different individual agendas, and varying degrees of member participation were underlying causes of these difficulties.

The project director was under the impression that all participants were seeking similar goals. It became obvious that this was not true. In an attempt to customize the New Hampshire Model for each participating district, the model was nearly lost.

However, with the help of consultants, the State Board of Education, State Department of Education, the Center for the Study of Public Policy and some local board members, the project staff was able to get back on track (designing systems to implement the New Hampshire Model).

At no time during the process of system development was there adequate time for local board involvement. This was due in part to board member decision. However, the primary cause was the nature of the position of school board members in New Hampshire. (These positions are part-time and usually unpaid; the average school board may meet only once or twice a month.)

At the public level, the project staff was told to conduct a public information program, and at no time was it to sell or conduct a sales program. This mandate came from the superintendents and was contrary to the position of the NIE and the

State Board of Education. Although the NIE and the State Board representatives at no time used the words "sell the public," the project director received mandates to become "aggressive" or to take "a stronger advocacy position."

It was the position of the staff that the project was designed to "study" and "plan," not sell. This position was maintained throughout our public information process. In short, the staff was to provide the communities with the results of their study in order that a decision could be made at the local school district meeting by the voters of the respective participating communities. With this in mind, there was insufficient time to educate the populace of the participating communities. It can be said, however, that the twelve months would have provided more than sufficient time to "sell" these communities had that been the objective at the local level.

List of Meetings Attended By
Project Staff from
April 16, 1975 - April 15, 1976

4/16/75	-started work at 17 North Street, Manchester, N.H.
	-met with Bill Milne
4/17/75	-met with E. McEvoy, S. Corcoran, staff secretaries
4/21/75	-met with potential assistant directors
4/22/75	-met with potential assistant directors
4/23/75	-met with Peter Bateman, CSPP
4/25/75	-met with potential assistant directors
	-met with Jack Menge
4/29/75	-met with Superintendents
	-met with W. Bittenbender, Comm. Paire, Jack Menge, B. Milne
5/ 2/75	-met with Jack Menge
5/ 5/75	-met with Elaine Piccini, NIE
5/7/75	-met with Superintendents
	-met with Advisory Board (Executive Board)
5/ 8/75	-met with Jack Menge
5/12/75	-met with Peter Bateman
5/13/75	-met with Hollis Principals
	-met with Allenstown Principal
5/16/75	-met with Deerfield Principals
	-met with Jack Menge
5/19/75	-met with Peter Bateman
5/20/75	-met with Bill Milne
5/26/75	-meeting at Allenstown Elem. with teachers
5/27/75	-met with Candia Principal
5/28/75	-met teachers in Hollis
6/2/75	-met with Bill Milne
6/3/75	-met with Superintendents
	-met with Hooksett Board
6/4/75	-met with Bill Milne
	-met with Deerfield teachers
6/5/75	-met with Gordon Donaldson
6/9/75	-met with Dave Cawley
	-met with Peter Bateman
	-met with Jack Menge
	-met with Hooksett teachers
6/10/75	-met with Bill Milne
6/12/75	-met with Dick Gustafson
	-met with Peter Bateman
	-met with Jack Menge
6/13/75	-met with Jack Menge
6/16/75	-met with R. Brunelle
6/17/75	-met with CEFS, Durham
6/18/75	-met with Bill Milne
	-met with State Board
6/20/75	-met with Jack Menge
6/24/75	-met with the Allenstown School Board
6/30/75	-met with Bill Milne
7/1/75	-met with G. Donaldson
7/2/75	-met with Dotty Lynch-Cambridge Survey Research

7/9/75	-executive committee meeting
7/9/75	-met with Hollis Board
7/11/75	-met with H. Roy and Jack Menge
7/15/75	-met with Tom Tooney, Cortland College
5/16/75	-met with Gordon Donaldson
7/21/75	-met with Bill Milne
7/23/75	-met with J. Menge
7/23/75	-met with N. Paire, Mr. Gross, B. Bittenbender, B. Milne and Jack Menge
7/25/75	-met with Gordon Donaldson
7/28/75	-met with Paul Fillion - State Department of Education, division of Administration
8/5/75	-met with H. McLaughlin, Supt. of Schools, Manchester
	-met with Bill Milne
8/6/75	-met with executive committee
	-met with Hooksett Study Committee
8/7/75	-met with E. Piccini, R. Cunningham, R. Gustafson and J. Menge
8/8/75	-met with Jack Menge
8/12/75	-met with executive committee
8/14/75	-met with Gerry Croteau
8/20/75	-met with Candia School Board
8/21/75	-met with Jack Menge
8/22/75	-met with new principal Candia-Tim Sweeny
8/27/75	-met with Pembroke Board
9/2/75	-met with Bill Milne
9/4/75	-met with Allyn Assoc.-public relations firm
9/5/75	-met with J. Menge
9/10/75	-met with Jack Menge
	-met with Dave Cohen, N. Paire, B. Bittenbender, B. Milne, Maive McDermott and Jack Menge
9/11/75	-met with Henry Roy
	-Executive Committee meeting
9/12/75	-met with Jack Menge
9/15/75	-met with Bill Milne
9/17/75	-met with Allyn Assoc.
	-met with M. Gross, Jack Menge, Bill Milne
9/18/75	-met with P. Boucher-Special Ed. Services
	-met with Allyn Associates
	-met with parent group in Hollis
9/23/75	-met with Gordon Donaldson
	-Executive Board meeting
9/24/75	-met with Bill Milne
	-met with parent from Allenstown
9/25/75	-met with Henry Roy, Jack Menge
10/1/75	-met with N. Paire, W. Bittenbender, B. Milne
10/2/75	-met with Gordon Donaldson
	-met with Gerald Croteau
10/6/75	-Executive Committee meeting
	-met with Bill Milne
10/7/75	-met with Jack Menge
10/8/75	-met with Richard Gustafson
	-met with Gerald Croteau

10/15/75 -Executive Board Meeting
10/17/75 -met with P. Bateman, Maive McDermott, Bill Milne
10/21/75 -met with Bill Milne
10/22/75 -met with Peter Bateman, Maive McDermott, Bill Milne
-met with Jim VanVliet (Hooksett Board Member)
10/24/75 -met with Jerry Lavoie (Allenstown Board Member)
10/27/75 -met with Henry Roy
10/28/75 -met with Richard Gustafson
-met with T. Adams (NHEA)
-met with Henry Roy
-met with Deerfield Budget Committee
10/29/75 -met with D. Young (Transportation Consultant)
10/31/75 -met with Peter Bateman, Maive McDermott
11/3/75 -met with Bill Milne
11/4/75 -met with Jack Menge
-met with Dave Cohen, Jack Menge
11/7/75 -met with N. Paire, B. Brunelle, Bill Milne
-met with the Non-Public School Committee
11/10/75 -met with Gordon Donaldson
11/12/75 -met with N. Paire, Bill Milne
-met with Jack Menge, Peter Bateman, Maive McDermott
11/13/75 -met with P. Fillion, Fred LaPlante (Tax Commission)
11/14/75 -met with Jack Menge
11/17/75 -met with C.M. Lienwand
11/19/75 -met with Richard Gustafson
11/22/75 -met with Dave Cohen, Jack Menge
11/24/75 -met with Gordon Donaldson
-Executive Board Meeting
12/1/75 -met with Dave Cawley, Gerry Croteau
12/2/75 to
12/5/75 -Alum Rock visit
12/12/75 -met with Jack Menge (Salem)
12/15/75 -met with Gordon Donaldson
-met with Executive Board
12/17/75 -met with Donald Young
-met with Henry Roy
12/19/75 -met with Bill Milne, F. LaPlante
12/23/75 -met with Bill Milne
12/30/75 -met with Salem Board meeting
1/5/76 -met with C.M. Lienwand
1/8/76 -met with Henry Roy
-met with Dave Cawley
1/9/76 -met with Gerry Croteau
-met with Peter Bateman, Maive McDermott, Bill Milne
-met with Jack Menge
1/11/76 -met with Henry Roy
-met with Hooksett School Board
1/12/76 -met with Bill Milne
-met with Hollis School Board
1/13/76 -met with Jack Menge
-met with Hollis School Board
1/14/76 -met with Robert Cunningham, Dennis Doyle - Washington
1/15/76 -meet with Hollis Budget Committee
1/19/76 -Executive Board Meeting
1/20/76 -Budget Committee meeting Hooksett

1/22/76	-met with Dave Cawley
	-met with Richard Gustafson
	-met with Bill Milne
1/23/76	-met with Hooksett Budget Committee
1/27/76	-met with Rebecca Furie, Bill Milne
1/29/76	-met with Paul Johnson
1/30/76	-met with Rebecca Furie
	-met with Dave Cawley
	-met with Gordon Donaldson
2/2/76	-met with Bill Milne
2/3/76	-met with Allenstown teachers
2/4/76	-met with Hooksett resident
	-met with Hollis teachers
2/5/76	-met with Don Young
	-met with Candia teachers
	-met with Candia community
2/6/76	-met with Deerfield Board
	-met with Hooksett Board
2/10/76	-met with Paul Johnson, R. Furie, D. Doyle, R. Cunningham
	-met with Hooksett teachers
	-met with Allenstown community
2/11/76	-met with Don Young
	-met with Deerfiled teachers
	-met with Deerfield community
2/12/76	-met with Hooksett community
2/17/76	-met with Newell Paire, Bill Milne
2/18/76	-met with Salem Budget Committee
2/19/76	-met with Rebecca Furie
2/23/76	-met with State Board of Education
	-met with S. Kennedy, Salem Budget Committee
2/25/76	-met with Gordon Donaldson
	-Salem Budget Hearing
3/1/76	-met with civic group - Salem
3/3/76	-met with pre-school owners-Salem
3/4/76	-met with Gordon Donaldson
	-Candia District meeting
3/10/76	-met with Peter Bateman, Maive McDermott, Bill Milne
3/11/76	-met with Salem Community
3/18/76	-met with D. Noyes
	-Salem television panel presentation
3/20/76	-Salem School District meeting
3/29/76	-met with Bill Milne
3/31/76	-met with correspondent-Tom Farreter
4/2/76	-met with Executive Board
4/7/76	-channel 11-Durham-television presentation with Bill Milne

OTHER OUTCOMES

This section includes products that were not included in the PHASE I and PHASE II REPORTS or that were not forwarded to NIE, the Center for the Study of Public Policy or the New Hampshire State Department of Education.

Generally, the documents include information concerning voucher value determination, annual district meeting preparation and efforts expended in working in the Salem School District.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS

The community survey was thought of by the project as the primary method of establishing a base-line of parent information from which various implementation services could be developed. The local boards looked at the community survey with a single primary concern--how many parents would shift their children to what kind of schools? This particular question was, in fact, the most important piece of information required from the survey before the district meetings, as it would have considerable effect on the presentation of the proposal to the meeting.

The results of the survey in this regard were, in fact, utilized in determining voucher budget amounts as described in another section.

The results of the remaining questions, which were also included in the published report from the contractor, were sent to all interested parties, and contain much useful information for the involved districts in the following areas:

Satisfaction with school system
Parental involvement in the schools
Attitudes towards education in general
School financing
General attitudes toward transferring children
Voucher information
Reasons for choosing a school
Types of schools

The voucher system

Transportation

Transfer estimates

Appendices showing results of each question by town were included, and three volumes of hard copy computer data from which these appendices were compiled are available in the project files.

The report on Salem's survey, done by telephone, includes the same kind of information contained in the reports mentioned above. No hard copy computer data was obtained for Salem.

VOUCHER VALUES

Project Recommendations for Specific Voucher Values:

Using the form described in PHASE II, Appendix (E), specific voucher values were computed by the project staff and reviewed by the superintendents and local boards. The most difficult figure to determine was the "Amount to Provide an Alternative." Theoretically, this amount could be determined by a simple review of tuition rates of schools identified as alternatives from completed "School Descriptive Statements." Realistically, financial information received on the "School Descriptive Statements" was incomplete and questionable. In addition, no district or school would make a definite commitment to be an alternative. Therefore, to establish a reasonable "Amount to Provide an Alternative," the project staff estimated tuition rates of contiguous districts in the same way as voucher values were determined for the participating districts. From these estimated tuition rates, the "reasonable" amount was determined so that at least two potential alternatives were available.

To determine a total dollar amount to underwrite vouchers for all of the eligible children in each district, the number of eligible children for the 1976-1977 school year was required. Estimated public school enrollment, including special education, was obtained from the local superintendents to be consistent with the numbers used for the public school budget estimate. Private school attendance was taken from the 1975 school census report.

A computation sheet (Appendix C) was developed to use the above described amounts to determine a "Total Appropriation (with vouchers)." The term "Full Use" was given to this method as it assumes every eligible child will be "backed" by a voucher of the established value. It will be noted that additional amounts are added for Transportation and Capital Outlay and Debt Service-Rental Charge because these amounts were not included in the determination of the voucher value.

The "Total Appropriation (with vouchers)" is compared to the "Total Appropriation (without vouchers)" to obtain a "Voucher Difference" which would be listed as expenditure on the total school district budget.

The lower part of the sheet compares the specific items of expenditure and revenue related to the voucher demonstration. It is easily seen, that except for the first entry, "Voucher Difference" or "Incentive Grant," the items are identical on both sides. These items identify the monies supplied by NIE to support the demonstration. The given amounts are estimates, exact amounts would be determined in negotiation.

When estimated voucher values for each district were used in these computations, the voucher difference obtained was generally a much larger amount than anticipated, usually being even greater than the total annual incentive grant. In other words, the district would have to commit its total incentive grant plus an additional amount to be raised locally, to provide sufficient reserve to underwrite all vouchers at the values recommended.

At this time, the community survey results became available, and the estimated number of children who would "shift" was determined. These would be the children requiring the established voucher value, while those remaining in the public schools would require vouchers at the "local cost" value, which was usually less. This would reduce actual cost to the district.

Since use of the supplementary vouchers was a local option, but had been included in the original "full use" method of determining the total appropriation, this was another area where estimated cost could be reduced.

Consequently, another method of computation called the "partial use" method was developed to determine the "total appropriation with vouchers." Comparison with the "total appropriation without vouchers" still yielded a positive "voucher difference," but this amount was much less than the difference determined by the "full use" method. In fact, the difference was usually less than the amount of the annual portion of the incentive grant.

The computation sheets for the "partial use" method are shown in Appendix D. These sheets also have the same comparison of EXPENDITURES and REVENUE that were used in the "Full Use" method.

The first entries, "Voucher Difference" and "Incentive Grant" require further explanation. When the "Voucher Difference" is <u>greater</u> than the "Incentive Grant," the amounts determined are entered on the indicated sides.

When the "Voucher Difference" is less than the "Incentive Grant," then the "Incentive Grant" amount is entered on both sides. The reason for this is that unless the "Incentive Grant" amount is appropriated, it cannot be spent.

In this section, the total shown on each side is the figure which would be shown on the local district's posted budget for 1976-1977.

When both methods were reviewed by local boards,the project was requested to use various combinations of grade-level, voucher types, and "method" to compare relative advantage or disadvantage to the district. Results of these reviews are shown in the completed warrant articles for each of the local districts which are shown in Appendix E. The warrant article appearing in the Appendix is a revised version of the article appearing in the PHASE II REPORT. The revision was made by the project's legal consultant for two reasons: (1) to remove an ambiguity in the last sentence concerning annual review, and (2) to include the voucher appropriation dollar amount so that it would not also be included in the total public school appropriation and subject to a second vote.

SALEM

When Salem entered the study/planning phase, it was determined that a part-time person to be on-site for the duration would be an effective way to provide that district and the project with the needed liaison. Accordingly, Rebecca Furie, a former employee of the State Voucher Project and already familiar with project goals and the community of Salem in particular, was retained. Her final report of activities in Salem follows:

ACTIVITIES REPORT

SALEM PROJECT

(2/9/76 - 3/20/76)

Goal 1: To acquaint the superintendent and members of the school board and budget committee with the New Hampshire Model.

Objective 1: To provide Dr. Johnson and committee members with copies of the New Hampshire Model and other pertinent material.

Assessment: On 2/9/76 Dr. Johnson & members of school board and budget committee were given copies of Model. At later time given copies of State Board of Education adopted regulation relative to education vouchers and parent survey conducted by Cambridge Survey Research.

Objective 2: To make available to committee members a local project representative who could answer questions and provide technical assistance.

Assessment: On 2/13/76 each member was sent a letter offering assistance.

Objective 3: To provide committee members with the opportunity to question project representatives in public forums.

Assessment: Mel Severance and Jack Menge addressed Salem School Board on 12/30/75. On 2/25/76 Mel Severance addressed Salem Budget Committee. (See assessment of obj. 4, goal 2)

Goal 2: To inform the electorate by making maximum use of local media.

Objective 1: To develop press releases and have them appear in three major newspapers.

Assessment: Three press releases developed and released to newspapers, radio, and CATV. All appeared in local newspapers (SALEM OBSERVER, LAWRENCE EAGLE-TRIBUNE and HAVERHILL GAZETTE).

Objective 2: To develop sufficient interest in the project that papers provide non-release coverage.

Assessment: Three editorials appeared in Salem Observer. Seven media-generated articles appeared in newspapers between 2/25/76 and 3/24/76.

Objective 3: To obtain local radio coverage of the project.

Assessment: On 2/19/76 Mel Severance appeared on WCCM, Lawrence for a one-hour "open mike" concept program.

Objective 4: To obtain local cable television coverage of project.

Assessment:

a) On 2/25/76 Mel Severance appeared before the Budget Committee. Gave brief presentation and answered questions from the audience. Media time 1 1/2 hours (potential viewing audience 2200 homes).

b) On 3/18/76 Mel Severance headed a panel discussion of education vouchers which was televised for approximately one hour. (See assessment of objective 5, goal 5)

Goal 3: To utilize existing groups and facilities to acquaint members of the community with project concept.

Objective 1: To assess community to determine which groups might be appropriate for presentation.

Assessment: Used Directory of Community Services, Kelley Library to complete.

Objective 2: To contact all appropriate groups and offer speaker.

Assessment: Beginning 2/26/76 Rebecca Furie succeeded in contacting representatives from six or eight seemingly appropriate groups.

Objective 3: To make presentations to any interested groups.

Assessment: On 3/1/76 Mel Severance addressed Kiwanis Club, attended by 23 members and guests. On 3/10/76 Rebecca Furie addressed Salem Association for Retarded Citizens, attended by 15 members and guests. (See assessment of objective 2, goal 6)

Objective 4:- To utilize existing group and local facilities to increase availability of informational material.

Assessment:

a) Copies of all brochures and N.H. Model left for circulation at Kelley Library and Salem High School Library.

b) Brochures distributed by public relations chairperson for local Girl Scouts and director of Open Door Kindergarten (reached a potential audience of 85).

Goal 4: To acquaint Salem residents with concepts of education voucher demonstration through series of mailings.

Objective 1: To develop four brochures for mailing.

Assessment: Accomplished by Manchester office staff.

Objective 2: To obtain computerized mailing list.

Assessment: Accomplished through supervisory union data processing staff.

Objective 3: To mail each informational brochures to 7,500 homes at planned intervals.

Assessment: Brochure 1, Concepts & Controversies mailed on 2/12/76.

Brochure 2, How the N.H. Education Voucher System Works mailed on 2/14/76.

Brochure 3, Notice of public meeting mailed on 3/5/76.

Brochure 4, Questions and Answers About Education Vouchers mailed 3/12/76.

Goal 5: To hold public meetings with sole purpose of familiarizing Salem residents with N.H. Education Voucher demonstration.

Objective 1: Make all advance arrangements for a public information meeting.

Assessment: Date selected, facility Salem High School Room 34 booked, necessary materials arranged.

Objective 2: To notify community of planned event.

Assessment: Invitational brochures printed and mailed to 7,500; information incorporated into full length press release for SALEM OBSERVER; brief press release developed for other 2 newspapers, CATV, and 2 radio stations.

Objective 3: To hold public information meeting.

Assessment: Public information session held from 7:30 - 10:30 p.m. on 3/11/76, 60 attended. Mel Severance made presentation.

Objective 4: To make all physical arrangements for a panel discussion.

Assessment: Met with Art Berlin 2/24/76, date selected, facilities booked (media center), necessary materials arranged, CATV coverage arranged.

Objective 5: To seek out appropriate panelists and arrange for their participation.

Assessment: SEA head Allan Zembruski, representing teachers; Nita Froelich, head of Barron School PTO; Judel Butter and Chuck Kelly, students; Joseph Sheehan, businessman and parent.

Objective 6: To hold panel discussion.

Assessment: Panel discussion held on 3/18/76 in Media Center, SHS, 7:30 - 8:30, 30 present in audience. (Potential viewing audience 2,200.)

Goal 6: To familiarize potential private sector educators with New Hampshire Model and provide them with information on implications of voucher demonstration.

Objective 1: Assess community to see who might provide educational alternative and offer program.

Assessment: Objective accomplished through assistance from school department of 11 local preschools contacted; one interested individual contacted; SARC contacted, parochial school contacted.

Objective 2: Provide potential educators with information on voucher demonstration through group meetings and individual discussion.

Assessment: On 3/3/76, 1:00 - 3:00, meeting for private preschool owners - 9 representatives of 3 programs (Reed Education Center, Open Door Kindergarten and Community Child Care Cooperative) attended meeting.

Barbara Rousseau spoke at length with Marshall Decker who expressed interest in establishing a private facility.

Rebecca Furie explained project and role of private sector in separate discussions to Mrs. Herman from Salem Day Care Center and Ann Playdon of Early Childhood School; both had express interest.

On 3/10/76 Rebecca Furie gave presentation to Salem Association for Retarded Citizens - 15 attended meeting.

CONCLUSIONS

DISTRICT VOTES:

In all but one community a budget committee played an important role in the construction of the school district warrant article. The community was Candia, New Hampshire, which did not operate under the Municipal Budget Law, therefore, Candia did not have a budget committee. The school board in this community recommended the article to the district for a vote. At the school district meeting the article was defeated 400+ to 6. (NOTE: A bond issue seemed to attract 600+ voters to the meeting. The bond issue was defeated and two hours later (12:30 a.m.) the voucher article was voted on.)

Each other community will be handled separately in the following review.

ALLENSTOWN: The budget committee recommended a warrant article for a voucher demonstration. The local school board's feeling was that the district had the right to vote the question, however, it did not support the program. The article was defeated. There was only minimal support for the article with no discussion.

DEERFIELD: The budget committee did not recommend the article, and the community did not have the opportunity to vote on it. The article was not supported by the school board.

HOLLIS: The budget committee did not recommend the article and the community did not have the opportunity to vote on it. The article was not supported by the school board.

HOOKSETT: The budget committee did not recommend the article and the community did not have the opportunity to vote on it. The article was strongly supported by the school board.

SALEM: The budget committee recommended and supported the article. The local board was split 3-2 in favor of the article. The voters defeated the article nearly 2 to 1 at the annual district meeting.

WHY DIDN'T THE VOTERS SUPPORT VOUCHERS?

In analysis of the results of the planning activities, the project staff have not been able to identify a sole reason for the voter reaction to vouchers. The staff have provided a list of reasons that were related to them by board members, parents, school administrators, teachers and non-parents. The list is in order of frequency of concerns that were recorded during the study and planning activity.

1) Potential cost to the district--increased taxes.
2) Loss of students--public schools would fail.
3) New idea--change.
4) Federal control with federal money--mistrust of the federal grant.
5) Church/State questions--public monies going to sectarian schools.

6) Private/Public questions--public monies going to private schools.

7) Decentralization of power--from a few to many.

8) Lack of specific answers about the future.

9) Lack of community understanding.

10) People weren't sold the idea.

11) Teachers didn't support the idea--fear of job loss.

12) Fractionalizing of the community--fear that without the community school a sense of community would be lost and in some instances a fear of a students' loss of a sense of belonging.

DISTRICT GAINS:

Although, the local districts gained no financial rewards for participation in the study in the form of cash, the project left them with the following information:

--A comprehensive analysis of their transportation system with possible alternatives for future development.

--A community survey of parents and non-parents alike detailing attitudes about schools and their operation.

--A new method for financing their schools.

--An experience in developmental research that involved four superintendents and five school boards.

--Provided several hundred individuals with additional information on how schools operate and how they may become involved now and in the future.

--Provided teachers and administrators alike with an understanding regarding school finance and public involvement that would not have been possible without the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS

NATIONAL LEVEL:

1. Funding for voucher research in the future should be limited to expenditures which would provide:
   a. a continuing effort at informing the public about the advantages of the concept.
   b. an ombudsman available locally to help small groups in obtaining and spreading this information.
   c. a coordinating capability between local groups to share problems and solutions.

Federal money should not be used to support any part of any demonstration, whether it is called "incentive money" or not! Direct involvement of Federal money implies Federal control and raises the question of "Who pays if the Feds pull out?"

2. Voucher research should continue, perhaps at the State level, specifically to investigate reform in educational financing. Efforts should continue to take the lessons learned from this project and others, and proceed toward a method of financing that will guarantee a district education at no increase in cost or better still, a decrease in cost.

It appears reasonable at this time, to assume that any model superimposed on existing public education systems will be doomed to failure because of the potential cost increase. It is impossible to operate two administrative functions as cheaply as one. Either the existing administrative structure decides to commit itself completely to a voucher-concept structure, or the existing structure is arbitrarily removed from

power by some higher authority and replaced by a totally new and voucher-concept oriented structure.

3. Develop and make available to potential voucher research teams the evaluative criteria which NIE is specifically interested in testing--prior to the actual studying/planning/implementing of a research project.

4. Limit study/planning/implementation of future education voucher demonstrations only to those states who have enacted legislation which would open such a demonstration to all their public and private schools statewide at least.

STATE/LOCAL LEVEL:

1. Study and plan at all stages with a diverse group from the community--do not limit membership on an executive board/advisory committee to public school officials and school board members.

2. Develop more fully the operational mechanisms prior to local involvement--allow the local committee to refine operational procedure once the overall model is defined and fixed.

3. Fund agents/ombudsmen at the State-Department-of-Education level to respond to parental demands.

4. Improve existing methods of accounting for educational programs--both financial and programmatical. This will make possible a clearer delineation of specific areas in education such as vocational education, academic education, and special education.

5. Legislate performance standards in education.

6. Review existing school and town census techniques and develop a system which would provide a single, complete annual enumeration to fulfill the requirements of both the school and the town.

7. Investigate the results of the community survey to obtain public reaction to school-related questions other than the "shift" indicators.

APPENDIX

A - Plan of Action Chart - Phase I

B - Plan of Action Chart - Phase II

C - Computation of Voucher Difference - Full Use Method

D - Computation of Voucher Difference - Partial Use Method

E - Warrant Articles for Each Town

1 - Allenstown

2 - Candia

3 - Deerfield

4 - Hollis

5 - Hooksett

6 - Salem

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
/ Task Completed

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE I

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
Administration				
1. Select Office Location	Project Dir.	Task Completed		
2. Rent Equipment				
3. Hire Secretary				
4. Hire Secretary/Bookkeeper				
5. Purchase Supplies				
6. Set-up Bookkeeping				
7. Place ads for Asst. Director				
8. Review Applications for Asst. Director				
9. Layout Project Task				
10. Interview Potential Asst. Directors				
11. Select 1st Asst. Director				
12. Meet with NIE - Project Officer			on going	
13. Meet with State Dept.			on going	
14. Meet with Center for the Study of Public Policy			on going	
15. Meet with Executive Board			on going	
16. Prepare Federal and Local Reports			as needed	
Data Collection				
1.0. Construct Community Profile	Bob Fay			
1.1. Collect Student Census Data		Data in-house		
1.1.1. Current Number of School-age Children				
1.1.2. Total Number of Students Eligible to Receive Vouchers				
1.1.3. Current Distribution of Students by - School, Grade, and Residence				
1.2. Review Local Census Data	Ex. Board Bob Fay	Board in-put		
1.3. Summarize Data	Bob Fay	Report		

APPENDIX A

(6/10/75)

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE I

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
1.4. Format and Document Findings	Consultant	Interim Document	*	
Projections in each District for the next Five-Years (1.5. - 1.8.)				
1.5. Conduct Demographic Study of District Population	Consultant	Report	*——*	
1.6. Conduct Demographic Study of District School Enrollment	Consultant Conslt. Dir.	Report	*——*	
1.7. Design & Clear Collection Instrum. for Facility Anal		Instrument	*——*	
1.7.1 Conduct an Analysis of Public and Private School Facility Capacities	Bob Fay	Report	*——*	
1.8. Design & Clear Collec. Instrumts. for Progming.Capab	Consultant	Instrument	*——*	
1.8.1 Conduct an Analysis of Public and Private School Programmatic Capacities	Bob Fay	Report	*——*	
2.0. Educational Alternatives				
2.1. Define Educational Alternatives	Ex. Board Barb Rousseau	Definition Documented	*——*	
2.2. Identify Educational Alternatives by Definition	Barb Rousseau	List Documented	*——*	
2.3. Design Format for Alternative Description	Consultant	Instrument on-board	*——*	
2.4. Clear Format with Executive Board	Barb Rousseau	Clearance	*——*	
2.5. Clear Format with NIE	Barb Rousseau	Clearance	*——*	
2.6. Mail Forms to all Schools within the Five Districts and Contiguous Districts		Mailing Complete	*	
2.7. Based on Return, Remail Non-Respondents	Barb Rousseau	Mailing Complete	*	
2.8. Review Results	Barb Rousseau	Program Description File	*——	

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

PLAN OF ACTION- PHASE I

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A
2.9. Package Results	Barb Rousseau Consultants	Alter. Package Complete		*
3.0. Community Information Program				
3.1. Design Community Information Documents	Consultant	Documents	*	
3.1.1. Verify Design	Consultant	Verified Documents	*	
3.2. Clear Information with Executive Board	Barb Rousseau	Clearance	*	
3.3. Mail Copies to NIE and State Dept.	Barb Rousseau	State & NIE Informed	*	
3.4. Disseminate Community Information	Barb Rousseau	Meetings Complete	*——*	
3.4.1. Meet with School Boards	Mel Severance		*	
3.4.2. Meet with School Administrators	Barb Rousseau		*——*	
3.4.3. Meet with Teachers	Mel Severance Barb Rousseau			*
3.4.3. Mail to Parents	Mel Severance Barb Rousseau	Mailing Completed		*
3.4.5. Mail to Students	Barb Rousseau	"		*
3.4.6. Set Community Information Meetings	Barb Rousseau	Meeting Complete	*—*	
3.4.7. Attend Meetings	Barb Rousseau	"	*—*	
3.4.8. Prepare and Release Items of Interest to News Media	Barb Rousseau	Releases Complete	*——*	
4.0. Community Survey				
4.1. Document Questions to be Asked	Proj. Dir. Bob Fay	Question Document	*—*	
4.1.1. School Boards	Ex. Board	Question Document	*—*	

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
✓ Task completed

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE I

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
4.1.2. Project Office	Proj. Dir. Proj. Staff	Feed-back Documented Spec.'s	*	
4.2. Establish Specifications for Survey	Project Dir. Bob Fay	Estimate	*	
(contract w/consultant to do 4.2.1. - 4.2.6.	Project Dir.	Consultant	*	
4.2.1. Design Instruments	Consultant	Construct		
(Clear instruments w/NIE & Exc. Board)	Proj. Dir.	& Design Clearance	*	
4.2.2. Verify Design	Consultant	Design Verified	*	
4.2.3. Test Instruments	Consultant	Instruments Tested	*	
4.2.4. Conduct Survey	Consultant	Survey Completed	*	
4.2.5. Format Data	Consultant	Data Formated	*	
4.2.6. Final Report	Consultant	Report	*	
4.3. Design Assessment Instrument for Attitudes and Expectations of the Voucher Project, Teachers & Admin.	Project Dir.	Instrument Designed	*	
(Clear Instrument)	Project Dir.	Clearance	*—*	
4.3.1. Mail Survey to Teachers and Administrators	Project Dir. Consultant	Mailed	*	
4.3.2. Pick up Survey	Project Staff	Pick-up	*	
4.3.3. Compile and Analyze Data	Project Staff Consultant	Data Analyze	*—*	
4.3.4. Document Data	Consultant	Report	*	
5.0. Definition of Choice				
5.1. Define what "Choice" will mean	Proj. Dir. Ex. Board Consult. Barb Rousseau	Definition	*	
5.2. Document Definition	Proj. Dir.	Document	*	
5.3. Develop Process for Review, to Verify that Every Student has a Choice	Proj. Staff Consultant	Process Developed	*	

(6/10/75)

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE I

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
6.0. Evaluation of Transportation				
6.1. Collect Cost and Capacity Data of Present System	Bob Fay	Data Collected	* —— *	
6.1.1. Analyze Data	Consultant	Analysis Complete	*	
6.1.2. Report Data	Consultant	Report	*	
6.2. Project any Additional Cost Based or Transfer Rate	Consultant Project Staff	Report	* — *	
6.3. Explore Expansion on Present System	Consultant Project Staff	Report	*	
6.3.1. Inter-District	Project Staff	Report	*	
6.4. Define the Process for Determining Incremental Cost Chargeable to NIE	Project Staff Consultant	Process Defined	* —— *	
6.4.1. Document Process	Project Staff Consultant	Process Documented	* —— *	
6.4.2. Estimate Cost Using the Process	Consultant	Cost Est.	*	
7.0. Research	Bob Fay Mel Severance Ex. Board	Research		
7.1. Identify Local Research Interest	Proj. Staff	Interest Documented	* —————— *	
7.1.1. Format in Terms of Objectives	Proj. Staff Consultant	Format Object	* —— *	
7.1.2. Establish Evaluative Criterion	Consultant	Criterion	* — *	
7.1.3. Establish Assessment Process	Consultant	Process Established	* —— *	
7.1.4. Document Results	Consultant Project Staff	Report Review	*	
7.2. Review Research Inter-Relationships	Exec. Board State Dept.	Complete	* —————— *	

52

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE I

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
7.2.1. Document State Government Design	Proj. Staff	Design on-board	*	
7.2.2. Document Federal Government Design	Proj. Staff	Design on-board	*	
7.2.3. Document Local Government Design	Proj. Staff Consultant	Design on-board	*——*	
8.0. Undesirable Effects of Test	Mel Severance	Effects		
	Consultants	Identified	*——*	
8.1. Identify Undesirable Effects of Test	"	"	*——*	
8.2. Document the Effects	Proj. Staff Consultant	Effects Reported	*	
8.3. Develop a System to Deal with the Effects	Proj. Staff Consultant	System Designed	*—*	
8.4. Document the System	Project Staff Consultant	System Documented	*	

53

(6/10/75)

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE II

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
9.0. Voucher Review Committee	Mel Severance		*——*	
9.1. Establish the Structure and Procedures for the VRC's Operations to include		Structures Documented	*	
9.1.1. Describe District's Political and Budgetary Processes		Process Documented	*	
9.1.2. Establish the Composition of VRC			*	
9.1.2.1. Develop the Membership Qualifications for VRC		Membership Guidelines Documented	*	
9.1.3. Document the Provisions for Staff Support		Provisions Documented	*	
9.1.4. Document the Funding and Process of Data Collection	Bob Fay	Process Documented	*——*	
10.0. Annual School District Meeting Process	Bob Fay		*	
10.1. Develop Procedure to be Followed at Annual District Meeting for Determining Voucher Value (s)				
10.2. Develop Process to Ensure an Article Appears Annually in District Warrant		Process Documented	*	
11.0. Determine Voucher Type & Value	Bob Fay Ex. Board		*	
11.1. Determine Kinds of Vouchers		Voucher types & Values Established		
11.2. Calculate Minimum Allowable Value for Voucher (s)			*	
11.3. Determine Type and Value of Supplemental Vouchers			*	
12.0. Determine Voucher Use	Barb Rousseau	System Documented	*	
12.1. Establish System for Cashing Vouchers			*	

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

PLAN OF ACTION- PHASE II

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A
13.0. Set-up Administrative Mechanisms	Mel Severance	Mechanism Documented	* ——— *	
13.1. Document Structure of Educational Voucher Authority (EVA)			*	
13.1.1. Establish Operational Guidelines for EVA			*	
13.1.2. Consider Size, Organization, Legal Authority and Composition of EVA			*	
13.1.3. Review the Need for the Creation of Trust Funds for Transferring of Funds within and between School Districts			*	
13.1.3.1. Verify the Application of Federal and State Account Regulations			*	
13.1.3.2. Establish System for Voucher Verification Use			*	
13.1.3.3. Establish Attendance Reporting System	Bob Fay		*	
13.1.3.4. Establish Auditing Programs	Mel Severance Bob Fay		*	
13.1.3.5. Calculate Average Daily Value of Voucher(s)	Mel Severance Ex. Committee		*	
13.1.4. Develop System for Redeeming Voucher(s) for Cash	Mel Severance Barb Rousseau		*	
13.1.4.1. Format Redemption Schedule for Parents	Mel Severance Barb Rousseau		*	
13.1.4.2. Format Payment Schedule for Schools	Mel Severance Barb Rousseau			
13.1.5. Inform Parents of Available Alternatives	Barb Rousseau		*	
13.1.5.1. Common Format Information for all Parents (see task 2.0.)			*	

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE II

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M.
13.1.5.2. Review Mechanisms for Truth-in-Advertising	Barb Rousseau	Mechanism Documented	*	
13.1.5.3. Establish Parent Counseling Systems on Vouchers and Registering Process			*	
14.0. Document the Federal Budget	Mel Severance	Federal Support Documented	* —— *	
14.1. Setting up of Special District Accounts to Provide other Nontuition Grants			*	
14.1.1. Review Transportation Needs	Bob Fay		*	
14.1.2. Review Administrative Needs			*	
14.2. Define Specific Costs to be Covered by Each Account			*	
14.2.1. Estimate Particular Grant for Operational Year			*	
14.2.2. Projection of Each Year for Lifetime of Project	Consultant		*	
14.3. Identifying of Specific Costs Chargeable to NIE			*	
14.3.1. Establish Criteria for Judging Whether or not Costs are Direct Result of Voucher Test			*	
14.4. Provide for Handling Funds that Remain in District Budget at End of School Year			*	
14.5. Establish Procedure for Returning or Retaining Portion of Incentive Grant Should Premature Withdrawal Occur			*	
15.0. Voucher Distribution System	Barb Rousseau	Distribution System Completed	* —— *	

(6/10/75)

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE II

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
15.1. Develop System for Voucher Distribution to all Eligible Families	Barb Rousseau	Distribution System Completed	*	
15.1.1. Develop Activity Timetable for Parents			*	
15.1.1.1. Information on Voucher			*	
15.1.1.2. Distribution of Voucher			*	
15.1.1.3. Registration of Parents' Choices			*	
15.1.2. Design Procedures for Handling Late Registrations and Transfers			*	
15.1.3. Analyze Existing Contracts between Districts and Other Schools			*	
16.0. Transportation	Bob Fay Consultant	System Design	* —— *	
16.1. Design and Develop Transportation System			* —— *	
17.0. New Schools Information Program (non-public schools)	Barb Rousseau Bob Fay	Individuals Informed	* —— *	
17.1. Organize and Conduct Information Program for Parents and Teachers				
17.1.1. Provide Written Explanation of Mechanisms that are Necessary for Establishing New Schools			*	
17.1.2. Set-up and Attend Meetings with Interested Community Residents in Order to Outline			*	
18.0. Evaluation System	Mel Severance	Evaluation System Documented	* —— *	

(6/10/75)

* Task to be done
/ Task completed

PLAN OF ACTION - PHASE II

EDUCATION VOUCHERS STUDY/PLANNING PROJECT

TASKS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED	INDIV. RESP.	RESULTS	1975 F. M. A. M. J. J. A. S. O. N. D.	1976 J. F. M. A.
18.1. Set up Evaluation Program Based on Research Objectives each School Board Established in Phase I	Mel Severance	Evaluation System Documented	*	
18.2. Coordinate Evaluation with NH Department of Education and with NIE			*	
18.3. Arrange for Common Use of Test Material			*	
18.4. Set up Individual Safeguards			*	
18.4.1. Respondent's Right to Privacy			*	
18.4.2. Data Confidentiality			*	
19.0. Phaseout Test	Mel Severance Project Staff	Procedure Documented	* *	
19.1. Recommend Procedure and Timetable for Phaseout of Federal Funding by June, 1983 Such as			*	
19.1.1. Process for the Reduction or Deletion of Various Funds			*	
19.1.2. Develop Procedures for District's Assuming of Program Costs			*	
19.1.3. Establish Contingency Plans Should Voucher System not Continue Beyond 1982			*	
20.0. Contracts - commitment of student - to specific schools	Mel Severance	Contracts Review	* *	

APPENDIX C

COMPUTATION OF VOUCHER DIFFERENCE - FULL USE METHOD

DATE _____ DISTRICT _____

GRADE LVL.	VOUCHER VAL.	x	EST. ENROLLMENT		
Elem.	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Middle/Jr.	_____	x	_____	=	_____
High	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Spec. El.	_____	x	_____	=	_____
" Sec.	_____	x	_____	=	_____
Voc. Ed.	_____	x	_____	=	_____

TRANSPORTATION (local)

CAPITAL OUTLAY AND DEBT SERVICE - RENTAL CHG.

Total Appropriation (with vouchers)

" " (without vouchers) _____

Voucher Difference

ITEMS FOR BUDGET FORM

EXPENDITURES		REVENUE	
Voucher Diff.	_____	Incentive grant	_____
Transportation (Fed)	_____	Transportation	_____
EVA & VRC Admin.	_____	EVA & VRC Admin.	_____
Tuition (pri. sch.pupils)	_____	Tuition (pri. sch.)	_____
	_____	Staff support	_____
TOTAL			

APPENDIX D

COMPUTATION OF VOUCHER DIFFERENCE - PARTIAL USE METHOD

DATE _____ FOR DISTRICT _____

COMPUTATION OF VOUCHER DIFFERENCE

ELEMENTARY VOUCHERS

Local Cost/Pupil	x	No. of Pupils (local)	
_____	x	_____	=
Voucher Value (choice	x	No. of Pupils shift	
_____	x	_____	=

HIGH SCHOOL VOUCHERS

Local Cost/Pupil	x	No. of Pupils (local)	
_____	x	_____	=
Voucher Value (choice)	x	No. of Pupils shift	
_____	x	_____	=

SUPPLEMENTAL VOUCHERS

Sp. Ed. V. Value (choice)	x	No. of Pupils	
_____	x	_____	=
Voc. Ed. V. Value (choice)	x	No. of Pupils	
_____	x	_____	=

TRANSPORATION (local) =

CAPITAL OUTLAY AND DEBT SERVICE - RENTAL =

Total Appropriation (with vouchers) =

(from S.U.) " " (without Vouchers) =

Voucher Difference =

APPENDIX D

COMPUTATION OF VOUCHER DIFFERENCE - PARTIAL USE METHOD

DATE _____ FOR DISTRICT _____

ITEMS FOR BUDGET FORM

EXPENDITURES

*Voucher Difference	=
Staff support grant	=
Share of EVA & VRC Admin.	=
Tuition (private school pupils)	=
Transportation (Fed.)	=
(A) TOTAL	

*When the Incentive grant is greater than the Voucher Difference, use the Incentive grant amount on this line.

Incentive grant - Voucher difference =

REVENUE

Incentive grant	=
Staff support grant	=
Admin. grant (EVA & VRC)	=
Tuition grant	=
Transportation grant	=
TOTAL	

(A) This amount to show as total in voucher warrant article.

APPENDIX E-1

ALLENSTOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT WARRANT

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE TOWN OF ALLENSTOWN IN THE COUNTY OF MERRIMACK QUALIFIED TO VOTE IN DISTRICT AFFAIRS:

You are hereby notified to meet at the Allenstown Elementary School in said District on the 6th day of March, 1976 at 10 o'clock in the forenoon to act upon the following subjects:

The polls for the election of officers will open at 10 o'clock a.m. and will close at the end of the meeting but not earlier than 3 o'clock p.m.

Consideration of Articles five through sixteen will begin at 1 o'clock p.m. at the Allenstown Elementary School.

1. To choose a Moderator for the coming year.

11. To see if the District will vote to adopt the Education Voucher Program for the school year 1976-1977 in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program as they exist and they may from time to time be amended by the State Board of Education: approving individual voucher value as follows for the school year 1976-1977:

Basic Elementary	$ 972.00
Basic Middle/Jr. High	$ 0
Basic Secondary	$1,338.00
Special Education Elementary	$1,341.00
Special Education Secondary	$1,846.00
Vocational Education	$1,699.00

raising and appropriating the sum of $406,496.00 to fund the Education Voucher Program; and authorizing the School Board to do all things necessary, including the right to receive and expend all federal and/or state funds available to the District under the program, including also the right to enter into agreements with the State Board of Education in order to implement the program as set forth above. Aproved by the Budget Committee.

12. To see if the District will vote to implement an in-service training program for the Allenstown Professional Staff through the auspices of Supervisory Union #53. Approved by the Budget Committee.

13. To see if the Voters of the District will vote to authorize the School Board to accept gifts and donations.

14. To have the election of all the School District officers, starting with the 1977 election, held at the annual town meeting, by separate ballot. (By petition)

15. To see what sum of money the District will vote to raise and appropriate for the support of schools, for the salaries of School District Officers and Agents and for the payment of the statutory obligations of the District.

16. To transact any other business that may legally come before said meeting.

Given under our hands and seals at said Allenstown, this 16 day of February, A.D. 1976.

Gerard H. Lavoie
Romeo G. Desrochers
Lawrence R. Dupont
Allenstown School Board

APPENDIX E-2

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SCHOOL WARRANT

TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE TOWN OF CANDIA, COUNTY OF ROCKINGHAM AND STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE QUALIFIED TO VOTE IN DISTRICT AFFAIRS:

You are hereby notified to meet at the Moore School, in said Town of Candia, in aforesaid County and State, on the fourth day of March, 1976 at 7:30 o'clock in the evening, to act upon the following subjects:

1. To choose a Moderator for the ensuing year.

2. To choose a Clerk for the ensuing year.

3. To choose a Member of the School Board for the ensuing three years.

4. To choose a Treasurer for the ensuing year.

5. To choose two Auditors for the ensuing year.

6. To see if the District will appropriate $ 415,000.00, or any other sum for (1) constructing and equipping an addition to Moore School including a Gymnasium and (2) making alternations to the Moore School and to determine whether such appropriations shall be raised by borrowing or otherwise, or to take any other action relative thereto.

7. To determine and appoint the salaries of the School Board and Truant Officer, and fix the compensation of any other officers or agents of the District.

8. To hear the reports of Agents, Auditors, Committees, or officers or agents of the District.

9. To see if the District will hold to adopt the Education Voucher Program for the school year 1976-77 in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program as they exist and as they may from time to time be amended by the State Board of Education; approving individual voucher value as follows for the school year 1976-77:

Basic Elementary	$ 1,004.00
Basic Secondary	1,342.00
Special Education Elem.	1,386.00
Special Education Sec.	1,852.00
Vocational Education	1,704.00

Raising and appropriating the sum of $ 200,375.00 to fund the Education Voucher Program; and authorizing the School Board to do all things necessary, including the right to receive and expend all federal and/or state funds available to the District under the program, including also the right to enter into agreements with the State Board of Education in order to implement the program as set forth above.

(IN PART)

APPENDIX E-3

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE TOWN OF DEERFIELD QUALIFIED TO VOTE IN DISTRICT AFFAIRS:

You are hereby notified to meet at the Town Hall in said District, on the 6th day of March, 1976, at 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon, to act upon the following subjects:

1. To see if the District will vote to authorize the School Board to accept gifts and donations.

6. To see if the District will vote to instruct the School Board to hire a qualified part time physical education instructor and to implement a physical education program into the school curriculum which will meet all relevant recommendations, and to raise and appropriate the sum of one thousand five hundred twenty eight dollars ($1,528.00) for the same. Disapproved by the Budget Committee. (By Petition)

7. To see if the District will vote to instruct the School Board to continue and expand the intramural and interscholastic sports programs under the direction of qualified coaching staffs, and to raise and appropriate the sum of one thousand dollars ($1,000.00) for the same. Disapproved by the Budget Committee. (By Petition)

8. To see if the District will vote to adopt the Education Voucher Program for the school year 1976-1977 in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program as they exist and as they may from time to time be amended by the State Board of Education; approving individual voucher value as follows for the school year 1976-1977:

Basic Elementary	$ 970.00
Basic Middle/ Junior High	$ 0
Basic Secondary	$1,338.00
Special Education Elementary	$1,339.00
Special Education Secondary	$1,845.00
Vocational Education	$1,699.00

raising and appropriating the sum of $147,504.00 to fund the Education Voucher Program; and authorizing the School Board to do all things necessary, including the right to receive and expend all federal and/ or state funds available to the District under the program, including also the right to enter into agreements with the State Board of Education in order to implement the program as set forth above. Disapproved by the Budget Committee.

9. To see what sum of money the District will raise and appropriate for capital improvements and operating expenses including the salaries of School District Officials, and agents, and for the payment of statutory obligations of the District, and to authorize the application and appropriation of such sums as are estimated to be received from the State Equalization Fund, and all other income, the School Board to certify to the Selectmen the balance between the estimated revenue and the appropriation, which balance is to be raised by taxes by the Town.

Given under our hands at said Deerfield this 12 day May, 1976.

Deerfield School Board

A true Copy of Warrant - Attest:

Deerfield School Board

APPENDIX E-4

The State of New Hampshire

To the Inhabitants of the School district in the town of HOLLIS *qualified to vote in district affairs:*

You are hereby notified to meet at the WALTERS AUDITORIUM in said district on the 1st day of March 1976. at eight o'clock in the after noon, to act upon the following subjects:

1. To determine and appoint the salaries of the School Board and Truant Officer and fix the compensation of any officers or agents of the district.

2. To hear the reports of Agents, Auditors, Committees or Officers chosen, and pass any vote relating thereto.

3. To choose Agents and Committees in relation to any subject embraced in this warrant.

4. To see if the district will vote to authorize the School Board to make application for and accept on behalf of the school district any or all grants or other funds for educational purposes which may now or hereafter be forthcoming from the United States Government or from the State of New Hampshire or from any other source.

5. To see if the district will vote to authorize the school board to participate in the New Hampshire Educational Voucher Project.

6. To see if the district will vote pursuant to RSA 31:105 to provide indemnification for school administrators, school board members, district officers or agents, from personal loss or expense including reasonable legal fees and costs, if any, arising out of any claim, demand, suit or judgment by reason of negligence or other act resulting in accidental injury to a person or accidental damage to property providing the indemnified person was at the time of the accident within the scope of his employment or office.

7. To see if the school district will vote to authorize the school board to purchase a comprehensive general liability insurance policy in order to protect the school district officers, administrative staff and itself against personal liability suits.

8. To see if the district will vote to accept the budget submitted by the budget committee and pass any vote in relation thereto.

Given under our hands at said Hollis this 12th day of February 1976

School Board

APPENDIX E-5

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

TO THE INHABITANTS OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE TOWN OF HOOKSETT QUALIFIED TO VOTE IN DISTRICT AFFAIRS:

You are hereby notified to meet at the Hooksett Memorial School in said District on the 12th day of March, 1976, at seven o'clock in the evening, to act upon the following subjects:

1. BY PETITION: To see if the District will appropriate $350,000.00 or any other sum for the purpose of constructing and equipping an addition to the Hooksett Memorial Junior High School, and to determine whether any such appropriation shall be gained by borrowing or otherwise, or to take any other action relative thereto. (Submitted without recommendation by Budget Committee.)

2. BY PETITION: To see if the District will vote to authorize the School Board to permit the voluntary recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the elementary schools of the District in accordance with Revised Statutes Annotated 194:15-A of The State of New Hampshire.

3. To see if the voters of the District will increase membership on the School Board from three (3) to five (5) members commencing with the 1977-78 School Year.

4. To see if the District will vote to authorize the School Board to accept on behalf of the District, any Federal or State funds designed to improve educational opportunities. Further, to see if the District will authorize the School Board to make application for said funds and then expend the same for such projects as it may designate.

5. To see if the District will vote to authorize the School Board to accept and to spend, in the name of and in behalf of the School District, gifts for the use of the School.

6. To see if the District will hold to adopt the Education Voucher Program for the School Year 1976-77 in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program as they exist and as they may from time to time be amended by the State Board of Education; approving individual voucher value as follows for the School year 1976-77:

Basic Elementary	$1,086.00
Basic Middle/Jr. High	$1,162.00
Basic Secondary	$1,572.00
Special Education	
Vocational Education	

Raising and appropriating the sum of $621,900.00 to fund the Education Voucher Program; and authorizing the School Board to do all things necessary, including the right to receive and expend all Federal and/or State funds available to the District under the program, including also the right to enter into Agreements with the State Board of Education in order to implement the program as set forth above. (Not recommended by Budget Committee.)

(IN PART)

APPENDIX E-6

2. By petition: The Salem School District vote to require the school board to make public any initial proposals that necessitate the school board, or their agents, to enter negotiations.

3. By petition: To see if the Salem School District will vote the sum of $2570 (Two thousand five hundred and seventy dollars) for the purpose of establishing a tennis team at Salem High School.

4. By petition: To see if the Salem School District will raise and appropriate the sum of $1800 (One thousand eight hundred dollars) for the purpose of continuing golf as an interscholastic sport at Salem High School.

5. To see if the District will vote to adopt the Education Voucher Program for the school year 1976-1977 in accordance with the rules and regulations of the program as they exist and as they may from time to time be amended by the State Board of Education; approving individual voucher value as follows for the school year 1976-1977:

Basic Elementary	$1133
Basic Secondary	$1400
Special Education:	
Elementary	$1564
Secondary	$1932
Vocational Educ.	$1778

raising and appropriating the sum of $1,876,956 to fund the Education Voucher Program; and authorizing the School Board to do all things necessary, including the right to receive and expend all federal and/or state funds available to the District under the program, including also the right to enter into agreements with the State Board of Education in order to implement the program as set forth above.

6. By petition: To see if the District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of $98,400 (Ninety-eight thousand four hundred dollars) to implement a teacher pay raise comparable to that given the town employees.

7. To see what sum of money the District will vote to raise and appropriate for the support of schools, for the payments of salaries of school district officials and agents, and for the payment of the statutory obligations of the district.

8. To transact any further business that may legally come before the meeting.

Given under our hand at said Salem this second day of March 1976.

(IN PART)

Phil Smith

SCHOOL BOARD

83

A true copy of Warrant.

Attest: Phil